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Abstract
This paper tries to interpret and compare social common damages related to social – linguistic and style of people’s treatment with each other. First of all, we explain this damages according to principles and a standard society and then we compare separately. This study is based on politeness theory that accounts on way of speaking including apologize and having good face versus threatening face.
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Introduction
Interpret and comparative social common damages related to socio – linguistic concerns with people’s behavior in period of day. Without doubt, everybody door encounter these treatment every day. We are not going talk about the reason of these routine acts. Because, several item would be include and maybe lead us far from our purpose. There for, we focus on these acts and their damages with details. Politeness is the expression of the speaker’s intention in good way removing threatening face and acts toward another. In contrast with threatening face, we have positive face to survey related damages cause with positive face and negative face to heaver and speaker. It is simple to understand the results and reflect of positive face and negative face in society.

Terms definition
Negative face
It is defend as “the want of every competent adult member that his actions be unimpeded by other”. In other words, it is linked to the basic human devise to be independent and free imposition.

Positive face
It is defined as, the want of every member that his wants be desirable to at least some others. This aspect of face is therefore the space for, so to speak, filling up the autonomous being with personal content, i.e. self – image that the person wants others to respect and appreciate.

Threatening face
A communicative act is a chunk of behavior B which is produced by S (speaker) with a specific intention, which speaker intends hearer to recognize, this recognition being to communicative point of speaker’s doing behavior.

Literature review
According to Brown and Levinson, positive and negative face exist universally in human culture. In social interaction, face – threatening acts are at times inevitable based on the terms of the conversation. A face threatening act is that in heavenly damages the face of the addresse or the speaker by acting in opposition to the wants and desires of the other. Most of these acts are verbal; however, they can also be conveyed in the characteristics of speech.

The purpose of study
The aim of the study is interpret social common damages that everybody encounter daily. By studying and interpret these damages, we hope lead to be familiar to knowing people’s
function for acting well. We want to describe damages cause
of their thinking facts derived from negative face. By
producing speech, it is face to hearer and speaker.

**Damages of Negative face – threatening acts**

**Damages to hearer**
An act that confirms or denies a future act of the hearer
creates pressure on the hearer to either perform or not
perform act.
Example: order, requests, suggestion, advice, reminding,
threats or warnings.
An act that expresses the speaker’s feeling of hearer or
hearer’s belongings.
Examples: Compliments, expressions of admiration or
expressions of strong negative emotion toward the hearer
(haleness, anger) an act that expresses some positive future
act of the speaker toward the hearer. In doing so, pressure
has been put on the hearer to accept or reject the act and
possibly cause damages.

**Damages to speaker**
- An act that shows that the speaker is influenced by
  hearer.
- Expressing thanks
- Accepting a thank you or apology
- Excuses
- Acceptance of offers
- A response to hearer’s violation of social science.
- The speaker commits himself to something he or she
does not want to do

**Research Question and Hypothesis**

Q1: what is reflect and result of Negative face – threatening
acts?
Q2: What is reflect and result of positive face?
Q3: Is there any difference between positive and Negative
face?
Q4: Has positive face any damage for hearer or speaker?

For talking about study and according research questions,
we are intend to get some point about following hypothesizes:
H1: Damages of Negative face is more than positive one.
H2: Probably damages of positive face is more than negative
one.
H3: There is difference between damages of positive face
and negative on.

**Method**

**Participants**
We are going determine the damages of Negative face for
both speaker and hearer. For this purpose, we choose two
groups with ages between 25 to 35 from the intermediate
level of some people, one as speaker and other as hearer.

**Material / Instrument**
As mentioned before, we have two groups, one speaker and
other one as hearer, for determine damages of negative face
for them. Here, we need some cases for doing and get some
results. So, we put some items to do, such as: order,
requests, suggestions, advice, reminding or warning for
acting and threading with each other as questioners and
testers.

**Procedure**
According to the number and kind of groups in this study,
The T-test is workable because, here we have two groups to
compute. First, we choose some people and divided them in
to two groups, one as speaker and other one as hearer. After
that, we put and ask some items on interaction cases speech
daily to do. It means one group do some offers. With
negative face to hearer by speaker. Then, we focus and
survey the reflect the hearer and speaker.

**Result and Discussion**
After surveys on reflections of hearers encountered with
negative face, we gathered some information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negative face</th>
<th>Damage to hearer</th>
<th>*Confirming deny orders or requests, suggestions, advice, reminding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive face</td>
<td>Damage to speaker</td>
<td>*Expressing thanks or apology or acceptance of offers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Damage to hearer</td>
<td>*Expressing of disapproval and excessively emotional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Damage to speaker</td>
<td>Acceptance of a compliment and inability to control one’s physical self</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Every cases of above mentioned depends on difference
situation.

**Conclusion**
To sum up, we should say, damages of negative face to
hearer and speaker are more than damages for positive face.
After surveys arises, clearly showed that, there is difference
between reflects damages of negative face and positive one
and also in some special cases, there is damages cause of
positive face.
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